

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are amended to clarify the invention, and new claims 9-25 are added to claim the invention in alternative language. Claims 1-25 remain for consideration, and all claims are thought to be allowable over the cited art.

The Office Action does not establish that claims 1-8 are unpatentable under 35 USC §103(a) over US patent 6,560,709 to Galovich ("Galovich") in view of US patent 6,246,768 to Kim ("Kim"). The rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action fails to show that all the limitations are suggested by the references, fails to provide a proper motivation for modifying the teachings of Galovich with teachings of Kim, and fails to show that the combination could be made with a reasonable likelihood of success.

The combination does not show a PLD having an encryption key in which a plurality of key bits define an encryption algorithm, and at least one bit for indicating whether more keys will follow. Galovich simply suggests encryption of data, and Kim suggests using 16 sets of round subkeys. Thus, neither reference suggests a PLD or a bit that indicates whether more keys will follow. Furthermore, Kim does not implicitly disclose indicator bits to indicate whether more keys will follow because Kim could use a counter to determine whether application of any additional keys is required.

The alleged motivation for combining Kim with Galovich is improper. The alleged motivation states that "it would have been obvious ... to employ the use of bit indicating whether more keys will follow, as Kim teaches, in the system of Galovich so as to uniformly assign key values in order to increase the strength of ciphertext data (col. 1, ll. 23-27)." This alleged motivation is not supported by evidence and is therefore, conclusory and improper. Specifically, the Office Action does not provide evidence that Galovich non-uniformly assigns key values or is lacking in the strength of ciphertext data. Furthermore, no evidence is provided to indicate how Galovich's

system would be improved. Thus, the alleged motivation is simply a conclusion and improper.

The rejection of claims 1-8 over the Galovich-Kim combination should be withdrawn because the Office Action fails to show all the limitations are suggested by the combination, fails to provide a proper motivation for combining the references, and fails to show that the combination could be made with a reasonable likelihood of success.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and a notice of allowance are respectfully requested in view of the Remarks presented above. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, a telephone call to the undersigned is invited.

Respectfully submitted,



Justin Liu  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No.: 51,959  
(408) 879-4641

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on September 17, 2004.

Julie Matthews  
Name

  
Signature